Case3:06-cv-00185-CRB Document147 Filed04/23/12 Page1 of 4

1	MARK RUMOLD, ESQ. (SBN 279060) 901 Cortland Ave., Apt B	
2	San Francisco, CA 94110 (415) 694-1639	
3	mark.rumold@gmail.com	
4	Attorney for Plaintiff William Pickard	
5	William Florara	
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11	WILLIAM LEONARD PICKARD,) Case No.: 3:06-cv-00185-CRB
12	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION REGARDING
13	v.	SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND [PROPOSED] ORDER
14	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,))
15 16	Defendant.	Hon. Charles R. Breyer Ctrm. 6, 17 th Floor
17	Subject to the approval of the Court, the parties hereby stipulate to modify the summary	
18	judgment briefing schedule and set a hearing date as follows:	
19	On March 30, 2012, Defendant filed its th	ird motion for summary judgment. (Dkt.
20	No. 140). In conjunction with its third motion for	r summary judgment, Defendant filed an
21	Administrative Motion to File Under Seal (the "A	Administrative Motion"). (Dkt. No. 142). The
22	Administrative Motion sought this Court's permis	ssion to file under seal Defendant's Vaughn
23	Index. By request of Defendant and pursuant to a	subsequent stipulation by the parties, Plaintiff
24	agreed to waive his right to service of the Vaughn	index, pending this Court's resolution of the
25	Administrative Motion. (Dkt. No. 143). On April	3, 2012, Plaintiff filed his opposition to
26	Defendant's Administrative Motion. (Dkt. No. 146). The Administrative Motion remains pending.	
27 28	Defendant's third motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 140) was referred to in Dkt. No. 139 as Defendant's second motion for summary judgment.	
	STIPULATION REGARDIN	NG SUMMARY JUDGMENT

STIPULATION REGARDING SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND [PROPOSED] ORDER No. 3:06-cv-00185-CRB

If the Court grants the Administrative Motion, the parties have stipulated that Defendant will serve the *Vaughn* index on Plaintiff, subject to the Court's sealing order. (Dkt. No. 143.) If the Court denies the Administrative Motion in full, then Defendant has the option of not making the *Vaughn* index part of the record in this case, or, within 4 days, resubmitting the *Vaughn* index for filing in the public record. *See* Civil L.R. 79-5(e). If the Court denies in part and grants in part the Administrative Motion, then Defendant may resubmit the *Vaughn* index in a manner that conforms to the Court's Order and Civil L.R. 79-5(e). *See id*.

Plaintiff's deadline for filing his cross-motion for summary judgment and opposition to Defendant's third motion for summary judgment is currently April 30, 2012. (Dkt. No. 139). However, pending a ruling on the Administrative Motion, because it is currently undetermined whether the *Vaughn* index will be part of the record in this case (whether filed under seal or not), and because Plaintiff currently lacks access to the *Vaughn* index, Plaintiff is unable to fully prepare his opposition and cross-motion at this time.

Accordingly, the parties have stipulated to modify the briefing schedule and hearing date as follows:

- The deadline for filing Plaintiff's cross-motion for summary judgment and opposition to Defendant's third motion for summary judgment will be thirty (30) days after the date of this Court's Order resolving defendant's Administrative Motion.
- 2. Thirty (30) days after the filing of Plaintiff's cross-motion and opposition,

 Defendant's reply brief and opposition to Plaintiff's cross-motion for summary
 judgment will be due.
- 3. Fifteen (15) days after the filing of Defendant's reply and opposition, Plaintiff's reply brief will be due.
- 4. The current hearing date of July 13, 2012, is hereby vacated. After the Court files its Order resolving Defendant's Administrative Motion, the parties will file a stipulation and proposed order setting a new hearing date. The hearing will be

1	scheduled for no less than thirty (30) days after the filing of Plaintiff's reply, on a		
2	date that is available to the Court and mutually agreed upon by the parties.		
3	Respectfully submitted,		
4	Dated: April 23, 2012 By:/s/ Mark Rumold		
5	MARK RUMOLD		
6	Attorney for Plaintiff		
7	MELINDA HAAG		
8	United States Attorney Dated: April 23, 2012		
9 10	By: /s/ Neill Tseng (by permission) NEILL T. TSENG		
11	Assistant United States Attorney Attorney for Defendant		
12	* * * * *		
13			
14	I, Mark Rumold, hereby declare pursuant to General Order 45, § X.B that I have obtained Defendants' concurrence in the filing of this document from Neill T. Tseng, Counsel for Defendant. Executed on April 23, 2012, in San Francisco, California.		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19	/s/ Mark Rumold		
20	Mark Rumold		
21	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
22	TORSUART TO STITULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.		
23			
24	DATED: HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER		
25	UNITED STATES SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE		
26 27			
28			
20	STIPULATION REGARDING SUMMARY JUDGMENT		
	BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND [PROPOSED] ORDER		

No. 3:06-cv-00185-CRB

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	I hereby certify that on April 23, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing document with	
3	the Clerk of the Court, using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the	
4	counsel of record in this matter who are registered on the CM/ECF system.	
5	Executed on April 23, 2012, in San Francisco, California.	
6		
7	<u>/s/ Mark Rumold</u> Mark Rumold	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25 26		
26 27		
28		
20	4	
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE CASE NO.: 3:06-CV-00185-CRB